



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.36-37/Inf.3

16 March 2026

**MANAGEMENT ACTION TRACKER
TRACKING ACTIONS TOWARDS EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Period Covered: January - December, 2025)

ADAPTATION FUND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TRACKING SHEET

Evaluation Title: *Thematic Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund Accreditation Process*

Evaluation Type:	Thematic	Evaluation ID (AF):	FY24_009S
Evaluation Start Date:	01-10-2022	Date Received for Response:	16/09/2024
Evaluation Completion Date:	14-04-2024	Date of management response approval by the Board:	10-10-2024
Focal Point:	Christine Woerlen	Person(s)/ Unit Responsible to Track/ Manage the Follow-up: AF-TERG/ AFB Secretariat	
Link to Management Response	Link to Evaluation		

<p>Overall response to the evaluation:</p>	<p>The AF-TERG report on the thematic evaluation of the AF accreditation process presents nine recommendations (R2 subdivided into three sub-recommendations), as outlined in Document AFB/EFC.33/11 and its annex. While the secretariat agrees with certain recommendations, it also holds different perspectives on others. In Annex I, the secretariat details areas of agreement and disagreement for each recommendation and provides rationale as necessary.</p> <p>Having considered the thematic evaluation of the Fund’s accreditation process conducted by the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group as contained in the document AFB/EFC.33/11 and the management response prepared by the secretariat as contained in document AFB/EFC.34/6, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) may want to consider and recommend to the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) to:</p> <p>(a) Take note of the management response to the findings and recommendations of the thematic evaluation of the Fund’s accreditation process as contained in document AFB/EFC.34/6;</p> <p>(b) Request the secretariat to prepare an action plan to implement agreed and partially agreed recommendations arising from the thematic evaluation mentioned above, for consideration by the Board during the intersessional period between the forty-third and forty-fourth meetings of the Board; and</p> <p>(c) Request the secretariat to report to the EFC, at its thirty-sixth meeting, on the progress made in implementing the action plan, as part of the report of activities of the secretariat.</p>
--	---

Management Response							Action Status (green, yellow, red)	Response Tracking 2025
No.	Recommendation	Management Agreement Status	Management Response	Actions Planned	Timeframe	Responsible Parties		
	List the recommendations from the Evaluation Report	* Agreed * Partially Agreed * Disagreed	Response from the entity that the recommendation targets	Indicate the concrete actions planned by partners to implement the recommendations	Please indicate a completion date	Please be specific and indicate who (Staff or Unit/office) is responsible for the actions. If it is a joint response it should list who these are specifically	Please select between On-track, Not on-track, Delayed, and No Action Required.	Please indicate status of implementation and actions taken. If an action is no longer relevant due to a changed context, please provide a justification and indicate if it should be cancelled or reformulated.
2	a. Updating OPG (re-)accreditation supporting materials. The OPG and the (re-)accreditation supporting materials should be updated to reflect the latest policy developments of the Fund, in particular, the new Evaluation Policy approved by the AFB in 2022. This process should include revisiting the reaccreditation criterion related to project performance assessments and aligning it with the project evaluation criteria outlined in the Fund's new Evaluation Policy. [relevance]	Partially Agreed	The Accreditation Panel is responsible to consider evaluation findings in its accreditation or reaccreditation of IE, per para 28 (d) of the new Evaluation Policy. The Accreditation Panel considers evaluation findings in its accreditation or re-accreditation of IE as part of the performance of the entity's previous projects under criteria 6 (Project preparation and appraisal), 7 (Project implementation Planning and Quality at-entry review), 8 (Project monitoring and evaluation during implementation), and 9 (project closure and final evaluation). The secretariat is of the view that alignment with the new Evaluation Policy is enforced during project/programme implementation. This approach allows for smoother re-accreditation procedures while ensuring that entities adhere to updated policies during the implementation phase, without the need of overburdening the reaccreditation criteria.	Since no action is planned, this activity is considered closed	31/10/2024	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The Panel is receiving assessment from the programming and RIK team which includes consideration on the alignment with the new evaluation policy. Since no action is required, this recommendation activity is considered closed.
	b. The AFB Secretariat in collaboration with the AF-TERG should clarify how the assessment of past project performance is being integrated into the overall re-accreditation criteria, in alignment with the new Evaluation Policy. [relevance, effectiveness]	Partially Agreed	This is related to R2a above, and the secretariat suggests that for entities in reaccreditation status, the secretariat, in collaboration with the AF-TERG, monitor the alignment of project performance assessments and align it with the project evaluation criteria outlined in the Fund's new Evaluation Policy so that the input on IE project performance from the secretariat during reaccreditation includes IE's management response and corrective actions to evaluation recommendations in cases where substantive concerns have been raised in para 28(d) of the evaluation policy. With such approach, no separate action is needed from the secretariat in this context.	The secretariat, in collaboration with the AF-TERG, monitors the alignment of project performance assessments and aligns it with the project evaluation criteria outlined in the Fund's new Evaluation Policy.	31/10/2024	AFB Secretariat AF-TERG	Closed	According to the reaccreditation approved in October 2019, this information is regularly provided to AP and the alignment with the EP is already part of that process. Hence, no further action is required.
	c. The AF Board may wish to consider establishing a standard procedure for updating the OPG's annexes every time Fund policies are approved or amended by the Board. This procedure should include an automatism by which the AFB Sec proposes changes, and the Board approves them as soon as possible. [efficiency]	Partially Agreed	The secretariat welcomes this recommendation and is currently revising the OPG integrating recent changes in the Fund's policies as requested by the Board. As part of this exercise, the secretariat will develop a standard procedure for reviewing OPG annexes whenever new policies are approved or amended by the Board.	The AFB Secretariat to suggest to the AF Board, for its consideration, a standard procedure to reviews the OPG's annexes every time Fund policies are approved or amended by the Board.	31/10/2024	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The Secretariat is in the process of developing a standard procedure for review and updating the OPG. As this requires alignment with other processes and will not be implemented immediately, the tracking of this recommendation is closed.

3	Capacity assessment and tailored readiness support. Early stages of the accreditation processes could include an assessment of the suitability and readiness of applicant entities to pursue accreditation with the Fund including concerning their capabilities and experience in identifying, designing, and implementing projects related to climate change adaptation. The capacity gaps identified in individual entities during the capacity assessment could guide the support provided to the entities, including through the readiness programme, for accreditation. [effectiveness, efficiency]	Agreed	<p>The secretariat welcomes this recommendation and concurs with the need for improved engagements with eligible developing country parties or Designated Authorities (DAs) in the early stages of the accreditation process. The recommendation also aligns strongly with the Fund's new medium term strategy (2023-2027), which has a cross-cutting theme to enhance access to climate finance and long term institutional capacity. The secretariat continues to work closely with countries to help them select suitable candidates for accreditation. The secretariat continuously seeks opportunities to meet with DAs at international forums such as the COP and more recently at joint workshops with UNFCCC and other climate Funds. The readiness programme of the Fund is central to effort and the secretariat looks forward to AF-TERG's evaluation of the readiness programme and how synergies between the Fund's accreditation and readiness programmes could be strengthened.</p> <p>The secretariat would like to add that the 2019 study it commissioned on "Bridging the Gaps in Accreditation" remains relevant in terms of prevalent capacity gaps, the accreditation and re-accreditation experiences of applicants entities and how to overcome those. The secretariat is considering an update of the study including the lesson learned since the first publication. The suggestion to pay heed to varying readiness levels of applicant entities is well noted, and this is addressed, in part, by the streamlined accreditation modality approved by the Board through Decision B.23/17.</p>	The secretariat continues to work closely with countries to help them select suitable candidates for accreditation. The secretariat continuously seeks opportunities to meet with DAs at international forums such as the COP and more recently at joint workshops with UNFCCC and other climate Funds. Performing an update of the study "Bridging the Gaps in Accreditation" including the lesson learned since the first publication.	10-11-2026	AFB Secretariat	On-track	The secretariat is developing new Readiness strategy with the inputs on improving in-country or DA level nomination process. There are case-to-case basis support being provided to DA of the countries with the recent example of a thorough selection process followed by Brazil for nominating to entities to pursue accreditation with the Fund. This practice is also being shared widely to encourage other countries to follow similar vetting process at the country level.
4	Pipeline Management. Building on its upcoming Gap Analysis of the accreditation and re-accreditation process (Decision B.41/2), the AFB Secretariat should present, for the Board's consideration, a policy for the efficient management of the accreditation pipeline. This policy should specifically look at strengthening the rules for elimination from the applicant pipeline. This consideration is crucial as eligible countries are limited to having a maximum of two NIEs, and dormant organizations have the potential to hinder the nomination of other entities for accreditation. [effectiveness, efficiency]	Partially Agreed	The secretariat welcomes this recommendation and recalls that the Board decided based on the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, to apply a more effective approach to managing dormant applications as per the Decision B.42/52. Accordingly, the secretariat is of the view that it is too early to present the analysis to the Board or develop new policies at this point. It would be best to enable sufficient time to implement the accreditation panel recommendations before assessing any gaps or issues.	Board decided based on the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, to apply a more effective approach to managing dormant applications as per the Decision B.42/52. It would be best to enable sufficient time to implement the accreditation panel recommendations before assessing any gaps or issues.	31/3/2024	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The secretariat, following the decision B.42/52 is periodically informing the DA and entity reaching closer to dormancy to ensure they keep the application active or consider replacement with another potential applicant entity. In addition, the AF Accreditation Workflow has been updated to send automatic reminders to the applicant entity including the secretariat if the application is coming close to dormancy. Therefore, no further action is required and the tracking of this recommendations is closed.
5	The fast-track re-accreditation needs to become faster. In addition to any action in pursuit of R6, and in order to identify strategies leading to the desired improvement, it is suggested to include fast-track re-accreditation as a central topic in the ongoing or a future Gap Analysis of the accreditation and reaccreditation process (Decision B.41/2). [efficiency, coherence]	Partially Agreed	This recommendation, however, appears to be grounded in the evaluation's findings that the fasttrack re-accreditation process, despite its designation, still takes a median duration of 15 months for the applications to complete processing. The secretariat is concerned that this finding lacks sufficient context regarding why a 15-month duration is deemed lengthy by the evaluation team. Additionally, the report fails to compare AF's fast-track process with that of other climate funds, which would provide valuable benchmarking insights. Similarly, the evaluation report's estimates are based on averages and do not consider cases that have significantly shorter completion times. The evaluation seems to overlook unique factors contributing to "outlier" fast-track re-accreditation applications, such as TLMS requirements and project implementation delays. It is important to note that the duration for all applications, regardless of the modality, depends on several factors, including mainly the responsiveness of the applicant entities. The proactiveness of these entities often dictates the pace of the accreditation process, which may be beyond the control of both the secretariat and the Panel, as further review by the Panel can only occur when additional information is provided by the applicant entities.	No particular action is required for this recommendation.	31/10/2024	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The tracking is closed as no particular action is required on the side of the Secretariat.

6	<p>Regular Reviews of the process. The AFB Secretariat should continue to implement regular reviews of the practice of the accreditation system. Such reviews should include a regular review of opportunities for enhancing clarity around the Adaptation Fund's expectations and reducing any redundancies or unnecessary bureaucratic formalities that are identified, including upon suggestion from the IEs and DAs. Examples for items to revisit are the five-year re-accreditation interval, the fast-track reaccreditation process, and opportunities to standardize steps or templates. [relevance, effectiveness, efficiency]</p>	Agreed	<p>The secretariat welcomes this recommendation and affirms its commitment to conduct periodic analyses of the accreditation system and welcomes the opportunities to standardize steps or templates. This initiative is crucial to ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the accreditation process, particularly in light of the GCF Board decision (Decision B.37/18) to extend the accreditation terms of all accredited entities by three years or until the adoption of a revised accreditation framework. Furthermore, the secretariat underscores the importance of the existing practice of periodically reviewing the accreditation system. This practice has been captured in Decision B.34/46, paragraph (d) where the Board decided that the gap analysis would be conducted "when the need arises" which is generally recommended by the Panel and/or based on AF secretariat engagement with the GCF. The recent gap analysis was presented to the Board at the forty-second Board meeting (B.42/5). The secretariat firmly believes in the effectiveness of this practice and is committed toward its continued implementation.</p>	<p>Conduct periodic analyses of the accreditation system and welcomes the opportunities to standardize steps or templates. Conduct gap analysis when the need arises (Decision B.34/46, paragraph (d)).</p>	31/10/2024 (and as needed)	AFB Secretariat	Closed	<p>The Gap analysis was conducted in 2024 and will be periodically pursued 'when the need arises'. In addition, the secretariat is also developing a comprehensive analysis of the current re-accreditation process with the proposal to revise it for faster, more efficient, and less burdensome approach to re-accreditation, including fast-track modality.</p>
7	<p>Differentiation of accreditation requirements. The one-size-fits all approach is providing efficiency except for when it is not suited. For specific types of entities (e.g., government ministries, research institutions) and specific types of projects, the standards could be adjusted to still satisfy the Fund's needs but better match the IEs' needs. However, at this point there is no clarity if the benefits of more specific criteria schemes would outweigh the advantages. The AFB Secretariat should analyse and propose for the AF Board to consider new accreditation models with differentiated requirements for different project types and/or sizes and introduce new modalities as needed, including potentially a project-specific accreditation option. Experiences of the other funds should be taken into account. [relevance, effectiveness, efficiency]</p>	Agreed	<p>In addition to the Fund's existing Fast-track and Streamlined (re)accreditation modality, the secretariat acknowledges the recommendation to assess the suitability of new accreditation models with differentiated requirements for accreditation for different entities / types of projects and relative opportunities to standardize steps or templates. The secretariat will examine and identify opportunities for new accreditation models by interacting with the DAs and other relevant climate funds.</p>	<p>The secretariat will examine and identify opportunities for new accreditation models by interacting with the DAs and other relevant climate funds.</p>	10-11-2025	AFB Secretariat	Closed	<p>The secretariat is currently developing a comprehensive analysis of the current re-accreditation process with the proposal to revise it for faster, more efficient, and less burdensome approach to re-accreditation, including fast-track modality. AF secretariat continues to engage with other climate funds on the accreditation coordination and coherence. As the accreditation approach of many climate funds are undergoing changes, any consideration for new accreditation model will be impacted and the AF re-accreditation process is currently being revised, therefore, the Fund will pursue new models for accreditation once re-accreditation process amendment is concluded to being adopted by the Board. In the meantime, the secretariat is continuing engagement with other climate funds on the evolution of new accreditation models to enhance direct access.</p>

ADAPTATION FUND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TRACKING SHEET

Evaluation Title: *Thematic evaluation of scalability concepts and practice at the Adaptation Fund*

Evaluation Type:	Thematic	Evaluation ID (AF):	FY24-008S
Evaluation Start Date:	01-05-2022	Date Received for Response:	16/09/2024; 23/03/2025
Evaluation Completion Date:	01-01-2023	Date of management response approval by the Board:	11/10/2024; 30/03/2025
Focal Point:	Susan Legro	Person(s)/ Unit Responsible to Track/ Manage the Follow-up: AF-TERG/ AFB Secretariat	
Link to Management Response	Link to Evaluation		

Overall response to the evaluation:	<p>In response to the recommendation contained in the above-mentioned thematic evaluation as contained in document AFB/EFC.34/5 the secretariat prepared this overall management response which provides detailed observations to each finding and recommendation of the AFTERG. Specifically, it identifies areas in which the secretariat disagrees with the evaluation, provides information on actions already being done to address some of the recommendations, and includes a detailed annex with specific responses to each finding.</p> <p>Having considered the report on the thematic evaluation of scalability concepts and practice at the Adaptation Fund by the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AFTERG), as contained in document AFB/EFC.34/5, as well as the initial management response prepared by the secretariat, as contained in document AFB/EFC.34/7, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) may want to consider and recommend to the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) to:</p> <p>(a) Take note of the key findings and recommendations of the thematic evaluation of scalability concepts and practice at the Adaptation Fund, including its annexes, and of the initial management response prepared by the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat;</p> <p>(b) Request the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat to prepare an updated management response and action plan reflecting the views expressed by the Ethics and Finance Committee at its thirty-fourth meeting on the findings and recommendations set out in the evaluation report mentioned above, for consideration by the Board during the intersessional period between the forty-third and forty-fourth meetings of the Board;</p> <p>(c) Request the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat to report to the EFC, at its thirty-sixth meeting, on the progress made in implementing the action plan as part of the report on the activities of the secretariat.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Management Response							Action Status (green, yellow, red)	Response Tracking 2025
No.	Recommendation	Management Agreement Status	Management Response	Actions Planned	Timeframe	Responsible Parties		
	List the recommendations from the Evaluation Report	* Agreed * Partially Agreed * Disagreed	Response from the entity that the recommendation targets	Indicate the concrete actions planned by partners to implement the recommendations	Please indicate a completion date	Please be specific and indicate who (Staff or Unit/office) is responsible for the actions. If it is a joint response it should list who these are specifically	Please select between On-track, Not on-track, Delayed, and No Action Required.	Please indicate status of implementation and actions taken. If an action is no longer relevant due to a changed context, please provide a justification and indicate if it should be cancelled or reformulated.
1	Adopt a unified definition of scalability and a means of monitoring and evaluating it. The evaluation policy provides a definition and criteria for evaluations of scalability. Fund strategies, other policies, and guidelines should identify a definition for scalability that is evaluable and use it consistently across the strategic results framework and implementation planning documents.	Partially Agreed	The Secretariat recognizes that it does not have an in-house definition of scalability nor is there a universal or unified definition of scalability adopted by the Fund. The Fund will take into consideration the definition of scalability proposed under the Fund's new Evaluation Policy and develop its own definition based on further analytical and strategic work that it is currently undertaking.	New definition to be determined.	31/12/2025	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The Secretariat collaborated with the Working Group of the Scaling Community of Practice to produce a case study on Mainstreaming Scaling in the Adaptation Fund. The Adaptation Fund supported this study as an externally led learning exercise to inform the development of its strategic directions and to contribute to the Mainstreaming Initiative of the Scaling Community of Practice. Based on the evaluation and case study, the Secretariat considered developing a definition of scaling for application within the Fund's context. In this regard, the secretariat has agreed to describe scaling as a breadth and depth of scaling and is developing a framework to account for this understanding.
2	Leverage the proposed activities in the Implementation Plan of the MTS II to support scaling, setting specific targets and indicators for scaling support to be provided under each pillar. This activity can be done in conjunction with the revision of the Efficiency and Effectiveness Framework (EEF) of the Fund.	Agreed	The Fund has adopted tools and approaches to incentivize scalability including the scaling up framework under implementation between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund. Also, there is potential for the Fund to use its internal resources. The Secretariat developed a revised Strategic Results Framework (SRF), which includes indicators that will support tracking of scaled-up innovations for effective long-term adaptation to climate change, as part of a revised strategic outcome 8. The EEF can include indicators and targets that track progress for the expected result "Evidence for effective action generated and results replicated and scaled up", under the innovation pillar of the MTS implementation plan. The development of a draft EEF will be undertaken in FY26.	Development and Board approval of the new/ updated SRF. The management response indicated that by calendar year 2025, the revised efficiency and effectiveness framework would also be revised with the inclusion of specific indicators to track projects scaled among others.	30-06-2026	AFB Secretariat	On-track	The SRF was approved by the Board at its 45th meeting. Consultations and desk reviews are ongoing to prepare a first draft of the guidance note on the application of the new Strategic Results Framework (SRF) (approved in 45th Board meeting). As part of this work, the Project Performance Report (PPR) template will also be revised in specific sections to accommodate implementing entities' reporting under the new SRF. In 2026, the Secretariat will initiate internal consultations for the revision of the EEF, with the objective of finalizing it in 2026. The structured scale-up framework with the Green Climate Fund (GCF) is in advanced stage at the technical level.
3	Update the guidance to IEs in the funding proposal templates to detail what is expected in an understanding of scalability. While not all projects should be scaled up, it is useful to understand why they might or might not be suitable for scaling and how scaling could happen if the project will pilot concepts and activities suitable for scaling.	Partially Agreed	While the Secretariat recognizes that scale-up and replicability are positive outcomes and important elements for projects funded by the Adaptation Fund as stated in the Operational Policies and Guideline (OPG) and its Annex 5 "Project/Programme Proposal Template", it is important to note that in accordance with the Fund's OPG, a scalability criterion is not separately required in project eligibility or review criteria or required otherwise. However, the Fund is already assessing project documents against the sustainability criteria that includes a reference to scalability and replication. Considering the importance of this element and building on the evaluation findings and recommendations, the Secretariat will work with implementing entities and operational focal points to better capture the approach to structure project at design stage for scaling up and maximized impacts. This aspect of replicability and scaling up as specific requirements in the OPG could be considered as a recommendation that the Board may want to consider as part of strategic discussion for the Fund.	The Secretariat will work with implementing entities and operational focal points to better capture the approach to structure project at design stage for scaling up and maximized impacts. This aspect of replicability and scaling up as specific requirements in the OPG could be considered as a recommendation that the Board may want to consider as part of strategic discussion for the Fund.	31/12/2025	AFB Secretariat	Closed	Updating the OPG in an ongoing and broader exercise that includes several aspects. Any change will require board approval and specific changes related to scalability cannot be undertaken in isolation. In light of this, tracking this recommendation further is not possible.

4	Encourage project proponents and participants to establish and strengthen collaboration and partnership with funds and actors that provide scaling support, particularly through non-financial instruments and in-country presence. It can be helpful to engage private sector actors - as potential innovators, scaling partners or investors. It is imperative to use the combined strengths of the varied set of actors in society to instigate social impact. Readiness activities may be a source of support for this type of awareness-raising and networking.	Agreed	The Secretariat acknowledges that nongrant instruments can be considered among the options for scaling up projects. Additionally, the Secretariat may encourage project proponents to explore non-financial instruments and pathways as part of the proposal development and during project implementation. This could be of particular relevance for the innovation projects. The new readiness strategy is expected to include enabling instruments or support in-country awareness-raising, bringing together private sector actors, CSOs, local and regional actors as potential innovators, scaling partners or investors.	The new readiness strategy is expected to include enabling instruments or support in-country awareness-raising, bringing together private sector actors, CSOs, local and regional actors as potential innovators, scaling partners or investors.	30/06/2026	AFB Secretariat	On-track	The work to revise the Readiness Strategy is on-going. This will expand the scope of stakeholders involved in the Fund's Readiness activities, including the private sector. The revised Strategy will be presented to the Board in April 2026.
5	Revisit the scale-up grant funding window and consider focusing Fund support for scaling under the action pillar window on single-country projects, where projects have scaled up using both the Fund and other funders, such as the GCF.	Agreed	It is important to highlight that under the MTSII, the implementation plan envisions an increase in the Scaling-Up Grant amount to \$300,000 per project. Additionally, its scope of activities and eligibility criteria will be expanded to include innovation initiatives and locally-led adaptation projects, further strengthening support for climate adaptation efforts. Finally, it is important to clarify that these grants could be used to scale up any type of project, regardless of the funding window. The eligibility criteria won't restrict scaling-up grants to a specific funding window, ensuring flexibility in supporting the expansion of a diverse range of projects.	No immediate action is required	On-going	AFB Secretariat	Closed	As no immediate action is required this is considered closed
6	Utilize the Learning and Sharing pillar of the MTS to increase the understanding of IEs regarding potential scaling pathways and types of scaling, particularly approaches that involve funds from public or blended finance. Continue and strengthen the engagement and learning of the AF secretariat, MIEs, IEs, and project partners in learning communities and partnerships on non-financial scaling instruments such as the Transformational Change Learning Partnership, the Scaling Up Community of Practice (CoP) etc.	Agreed	Under the Knowledge Management (KM) pillar of the MTS II and its implementation plan, the Fund has committed to exploring ways to further disseminate successful approaches to scaling up and replicating its projects. One such approach is through bundled learning and innovation grants. These grants will support the scaling of successful adaptation interventions by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying transferable adaptation solutions and systems change opportunities. Promoting continuous improvement through knowledge sharing and learning. Additionally, the Secretariat will continue to engage with learning communities, including the Scaling Up Community of Practice (CoP), by providing a platform to share information on innovative and scalable adaptation solutions.	Engage with scaling community of practice	30/06/2026	AFB Secretariat	Closed	The Secretariat collaborated with the Scaling Up Community of Practice through disseminating the Case study on scalability, which was finalized in October 2025 through the engagement with the CoP on Scaling Up: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Mainstreaming-Scaling-at-Adaptation-Fund.pdf The Secretariat provided training on the bundled learning/innovation grants as part of the workshop held in Recife (May 2025) and during the NIEs seminar in Ethiopia (September 2025). The first project of this kind was approved in October 2025. The Secretariat is also working on learning material for a virtual course on bundled grants. The Secretariat had active discussion with IEs on possibilities to scale projects through PMMs twice a year and other capacity building events. For instance, options for scaling up adaptation interventions were discussed with the implementing entities during the two PMM missions in the Western Balkans and Bhutan.
7	Ensure that the scalability criterion of the Fund's evaluation policy is well understood, review existing evaluation policy guidance for consistency, and include guidance on incorporating scalability into project design in the upcoming evaluation policy guidance note on project design.	Agreed	N/A	Review the guidance notes and incorporate guidance on scalability in the guidance note on project design.	30/06/2027	AF-TERG	On-track	The AF-TERG has completed the EP guidance note on project design and has provided reference on how scalability can be supported at project design stage. The review of the remaining guidance notes will be initiated at the end of FY26 and will continue through FY27.